DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 235 261 UD 023 101

AUTHOR Saltman, Juliet
TITLE Neighborhood Change: Theories, Realities, Prospects.
PUB DATE 83
NOTE 46p.; Earlier version of paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the North Central Sociological Association (Akron, OH, 1981). Research assisted by a faculty research grant from the Research Office of Kent State University.
AVAILABLE FROM National Neighbors, 815 15th Street, N.W., Suite 525 A, Washington, D.C. 20005 ($2.00).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Change Strategies; Community Change; *Community Organizations; *Desegregation Methods; *Maintenance; Models; *Neighborhood Integration; Racial Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Hunter (Albert); Ohio (Akron)

ABSTRACT

This study of one neighborhood stabilization effort is based on interviews with 312 residents of an Akron (Ohio) neighborhood which changed from 11 percent to 57 percent black in the past decade. The results of the survey of residents' concerns in this racially changing neighborhood confirmed Hunter's theory that organizations (in this case, The West Side Neighbors) can create a sense of community when none exists in transitional neighborhoods. Three indexes, not previously linked, indicated facility use, neighboring, and neighborhood satisfaction. The data were analyzed qualitatively as well as quantitatively. Though facility use showed a decline by white residents, neighboring and satisfaction levels were high. Two theoretical explanations of these high levels are a model of resident types, and an empirically validated link between knowledge of the neighborhood organization and perceptions of the neighborhood's future. It is concluded that more than the work of a neighborhood stabilization organization is needed to maintain an integrated urban neighborhood, and a comprehensive strategy for achieving stabilization in such areas is outlined. (Author/CMG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED235261

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Juliet Saltman
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

NEIGHBORHOOD CHANGE:
Theories, Realities, Prospects

Juliet Saltman

Kent State University

UD 023 101

Abstract

This study of one neighborhood stabilization effort is based on interviews with 312 residents of an Akron neighborhood which changed from 11 to 57% black in the past decade. The results of the survey of residents' concerns in this racially changing neighborhood confirm Hunter's theory that organizations can create a sense of community when none exists in transitional neighborhoods. Three indexes, not previously linked, indicated facility use, neighboring, and neighborhood satisfaction. The data were analyzed qualitatively as well as quantitatively. Though facility use showed a decline by white residents, neighboring and satisfaction levels were high. Two theoretical explanations are offered: a model of resident types, and an empirically validated link between knowledge of the neighborhood organization and perceptions of the neighborhood's future. A comprehensive strategy is outlined for achieving neighborhood stabilization in racially transitional areas.

For

NEIGHBORHOOD CHANGE: Theories, Realities, Prospects

NEIGHBORHOOD CHANGE: Theories, Realities, Prospects

This study is part of a larger one on the neighborhood stabilization movement. Stabilization refers here to the maintenance of racial integration in urban neighborhoods through organized efforts. Such organized efforts have been a prime goal of the neighborhood stabilization movement, and have been tried in over two decades of struggle by dozens of racially integrated neighborhood groups across the country.(Saltman 1978.) One such effort includes the neighborhood concerns survey reported here. The results of this survey reinforce Albert Hunter's theory (1975) that organizations can create a sense of community when none exists in transitional neighborhoods.

Hunter's theory is consistent with an approach to neighborhood change or succession which I am calling "Interactionist". This approach focuses on the relationship between social support networks and neighborhood preservation (Ahlbrandt 1979, 1975; Fischer 1976; Marsh 1968; Morris 1975; Suttles 1972; Zehner 1974.) The "Interactionist" perspective differs from the "Degenerative" approach to neighborhood change which suggests an inevitability of neighborhood decline once institutional forces have affected residents' locational choices and caused population turnover (Bailey 1966; Blair 1973; Bruner 1970; Ginsberg 1975; Little, Nourse, and Phares 1975; Molotch 1972; Varady 1979.) In contrast, the interactionist perspective does not accept the inevitability of neighborhood decline, and offers hope for neighborhood stabilization through social support networks. Though the evidence

presented in this study substantiates the interactionist view, I suggest that a much more comprehensive strategy is needed to achieve neighborhood stabilization.

The Neighborhood

Understanding the setting of the study is important and relevant to the conclusions and policy implications. The transitional area selected for the study is the largest interracial area of Akron, Ohio and the entire metropolitan region surrounding the city. The area is not only racially diverse, but is also socio-economically diverse with income levels ranging from low and moderate to middle and upper-middle income. It consists of 200 blocks, contains 10,000 households, and includes five census tracts. One census tract was chosen as the site for the study, being the only complete one in the larger area and containing the senior high school serving the larger area. The entire larger area corresponds to the attendance zone for the high school, and represents the boundaries of the local stabilization effort conducted since 1967 by West Side Neighbors.(WSN).

Between 1962 and 1982 the minority proportions of the area (hereafter called the WSN area) increased in some of the tracts by 50% or more, primarily because of urban renewal relocation and public housing site selection. The results of these programs were further exacerbated by real estate steering tactics and bank redlining, which is typical of the experience of other urban transitional neighborhoods (Taylor 1979; Helper 1969; Przbylski 1978; Saltman 1971, 1978, 1980).

The following figures indicate the extent of racial change in the study area, which was all white in 1950. The general per-

(Table 1 about here)

ception of the area has been one of instability, slowed only by the efforts of the local neighborhood stabilization group (WSN) from 1967 to the present. Because of the increasing racial turnover of the area, both residential and commercial, the general view was that neighboring had decreased and a "sense of community" (Hunter 1975) had been lost. People also believed that residents of the area were anxious and nervous about the possibility of further turnover. This was especially true of Tract 5062, the site of the study.

Thus, Tract 5062 was selected as the survey site because it was still racially integrated, had experienced much of the turnover trauma of the west side of Akron, and seemed to offer the best opportunity to study an area "in transition." In addition, the sponsoring organization (WSN) believed that the very act of reaching into the community and engaging in this "concerns" survey might allay some fears and serve to stabilize the area, and even offer a sense of community and neighboring - though temporary.

The Organization

West Side Neighbors, one of hundreds of similar neighborhood stabilization groups across the country, began in 1967 as a demonstration model of "effective integrated living." It was formed in direct response to local events which were affecting the west side of Akron critically: urban renewal relocation, public housing site selection, real estate steering practices, and school racial

imbalance. The organization referred to itself as a voluntary, neighborhood improvement association, dedicated to the maintenance of an open, integrated, desirable community. Its first ten years of work were unfunded, conducted totally by volunteer committees and a twenty one member Board of Directors, representing the diverse population of the area.

In 1977 WSN won the Akron area Brotherhood Award for "outstanding efforts" contributing to better intergroup relations. Its programs were typical of such groups, and included block organization, housing complaint resolution, area advocacy, newsletter and educational material distribution, and special community events (international smorgasbord dinners, arts festivals, and regular open meetings in rotating locations.) Since 1977, WSN received small short-term grants from private foundations and local and federal government agencies to continue its stabilization efforts. Its newest program is a unique Useful Service Exchange referral system of neighbor helping neighbor for money or exchange. This program is a direct outgrowth of the neighborhood concerns survey reported here. WSN now has one part-time staff person working out of its small store-front office, aided by volunteers.

Method

The data were obtained from interviews, field notes, and participant observation [1]. Both quantitative and qualitative analyses were applied to the data. Three hundred and twelve households were interviewed, representing 18% of all households in the tract, with complete geographical coverage.

Four households were randomly selected for interviewing on each block in the tract, with "block" referring to one square census block. Prior to the interviews, WSN flyers were distributed to all households on a block announcing and legitimizing the survey. Interviewers wore WSN identification tags. A separate sub-survey was conducted of all households with For Sale signs, reported below.

The structured interview schedule consisted of mostly open-ended questions, with occasional designated choices of answers. Each interview lasted approximately one hour. The interview schedule contained eight clusters of questions (83 total) concerning: 1) Facility use, 2) Sense of community, 3) Neighboring, 4) WSN impact, 5) Interest in a Useful Service Exchange (a new program contemplated by WSN), 6) Neighborhood concerns, 7) Real estate experiences and prospects, and 8) Respondent characteristics. Interviewers were instructed to include all narrative statements, which were later typed on sorting cards (McBee System) for ready ongoing qualitative analysis. The quantitative analysis was done with computerized SPSS routines, which included frequency counts and percentages for all variables, cross-tabulations between selected variables, correlations and multiple regressions for selected variables, and appropriate tests of significance (Chi square for the contingency tables and F tests for the multiple regressions.)

Three indexes, or scales, were constructed for determining facility use, neighbor interaction, and neighborhood satisfaction. Previous community research has not linked these three indexes.

Index One, Facility Use (FU), was based on four question responses, scored as 1 for use of facilities in the WSN area and 0 for use for outside the area.[2] The higher the score, the greater the use of facilities in the WSN area. The Index was based on grocery shopping, shoe repair, drug store, and cleaning/laundry facilities. Index Two concerned Neighboring (N) and was based on five questions: number of names of neighbors known, chatting frequency, exhhange of things frequency, and visiting frequency. Again, the higher the score, the more neighboring was present. Index Three, Neighborhood Satisfaction (NS), focused on specific concerns and was also based on responses to two general questions on neighborhood rating and neighborhood satisfaction. Nine specific concerns were included in this Index: noise, dogs, neighbors, kids, lawns, housing, business area, safety, and turnover. Regression analyses of the three indexes and selected variables are shown in Table 2.

(Table 2 about here)

Findings

Demographics. Respondents were 52% white and 48% black, showed a high proportion of middle income levels, and almost total owner occupancy (75% had incomes above $12,000 with 92% owner occupancy.) This was true for blacks and whites alike, though blacks had double the number (66%) of two-income households compared to whites, consistent with general Census findings across the country. Though the sample was almost evenly divided into those with and

without children under 19, the racial subsamples showed marked differences and reversed proportions. Two thirds of the blacks had children under 19, while two thirds of the whites had no children under 19. This was also related to age differences according to race. Blacks were generally younger, with only 3% over 65 compared to 27% of the white respondents who were over the age of 65. These results are consistent with those of national studies (Bradburn, Sudman, and Gockel 1971), though the income levels and owner occupancy are much higher in the Akron neighborhood than other interracial areas.

Also consistent with other findings elsewhere (Bradburn, Sudman, and Gockel 1971) in similar neighborhoods were the data on organizational involvement of residents. Respondents were asked if they belonged to or attended meetings of six types of organizations: work-related, church-related, civic, political, educational, social, or recreational. Twice as many did not participate in civic (68%), educational (64%), work-related (60%) or social (60%) as those who did. For church-related organizations, however, a majority of the respondents reported participation (58%). For political organizations, most were uninvolved (86%). These results are consistent with others for similar socioeconomic levels (Zehner 1974). Yet, surprisingly, a high proportion (76%) were interested in getting together with their neighbors for block meetings, and many were even willing to host such a meeting (44%). These responses formed the basis for an expanded block organization program later undertaken by WSN.

Those households with children under 19 had one third of them attending private or parochial school, with significant differences in white and black households. Three times as many of the white children attended private or parochial school as did the black children. This, of course, contributes to the public schools of the area being predominantly black, which is a negative factor for neighborhood stabilization (Ahlbrandt 1979; Bradburn et al 1971; Varady 1979.)

The single most encouraging finding in the personal data was the fact that whites were moving into the tract at almost the same rate as blacks, reversing a trend of over a decade of more black in-movement than white. Moreover, the whites moving in most recently had a high educational level (college-educated were 29% compared to 16% with moderate education and 11% with low education levels.)

Facility Use. Residents who used the businesses of the area used primarily drug stores, cleaning and laundry stores, and shoe repair shops, with only a third of the residents using the grocery stores in the neighborhood. Analyzing for racial differences revealed that the ones who used the WSN area facilities most were black. Blacks had 57% with high user scores compared to only 24% of the whites. Conversely, only 24% of the blacks had low user scores compared to 47% of the whites (X^2=18.10, df=4, p=.001). Hunter's study (1975) of facility use in a Rochester transitional neighborhood also found a general decline in residents' use of facilities close to their homes, but did not report a racial sub-group analysis. This finding reinforces

both Aldrich and Reiss (1976) and Yancey and Ericksen (1979) who found a strong negative effect of blacks on the number of facilities and services found in urban neighborhoods.

As Table 2 indicates, for use of facilities in the WSN area, 17% of the variance was explained by race and years in the neighborhood, with a total explained variance of 21%. Proximity to the shopping area was significantly related to use of facilities, but race was more significant than location in accounting for facility use by the total sample.

Neighboring. Scores on neighboring were considerably higher than anticipated, and were one of the most unexpected results of the Akron study. The data indicated that a majority of residents had quite extensive social ties with their neighbors, contrary to the common local perception of the area as one of great transition and turnover. Table 3 indicates that a majority of respondents knew the names of six or more of their neighbors, 77% chatted with their neighbors often or sometimes, and 54% visited in their neighbors' homes often or sometimes. These statistics hardly indicate an anomic neighborhood.

Interpersonal ties in urban neighborhoods have been analyzed extensively by others (Hunter 1975; Galster 1980; O'Brien 1975; Zehner 1974.) Hunter found that almost 80% of the respondents in his Rochester study chatted "often or sometimes" with their neighbors rather than "rarely or never". He found no significant association between decline in local facility use and neighboring, though the Rochester neighborhood did not undergo the extent of racial transition that occurred in the Akron neighborhood.[3]

Zehner's analysis of neighboring was based on visits and shared activities rather than chatting or knowledge of first names, as in the Akron study. He found that 40% of the residents in his study area near Washington D.C. visited their neighbors as often as once a week. He found no association between patterns of interaction and feelings of satisfaction toward the neighborhood. There was little or no association between interaction frequencies and demographic and socio-economic variables. His study area also did not reflect the extent of racial transition that took place in the Akron neighborhood.[4]

(Table 3 about here)

We wanted to find out what the concept of "neighborhood" actually meant to our respondents. Their conception was of an area smaller than five blocks. Sixty-six percent named street boundaries within five blocks, and only 34% went beyond five blocks in naming street boundaries of their neighborhood. When asked whether they felt any sense of attachment to their neighborhood, 80% said they did, 17% did not, and 3% were uncertain. This is considerably higher than national averages measuring attitudes of neighborhood attachment (U.S. Dept. of Housing & Urban Development 1979.) When asked whether they thought of their neighborhood as a small community of the City, 69% said they did, 26% did not, and 5% were uncertain. The sense of community revealed by these answers is related to the substantial degree of neighboring in the area, as other studies have also indicated (Ahlbrandt 1979; Varady 1979; Zehner 1974.) What is unexpected, though, is the extent of neighboring and

sense of community found in this racially transitional area, which I will try to explain in the discussion section.

Satisfaction. Table 4 shows the generally high level of satisfaction with the neighborhood for the total sample and for the racial subsample. Seventy percent of the respondents rated the neighborhood excellent or good, and 90% were very satisfied or pretty satisfied with their neighborhood. This level of satisfaction is retained in the racial breakdown, with only a four percent difference in black and white attitudes (lower for blacks.) Though national surveys indicate that most people in the United States rate their neighborhoods excellent or good places to live (HUD Annual Housing Survey 1979), this is not the case with racially transitional neighborhoods or those that are considered substantially integrated or segregated (Bradburn, Sudman, and Glockel 1971.) (Table 4 about here)

Concerns. The specific concerns of the residents are shown in Table 5, with a rank order of 21 concerns considered as serious or somewhat serious problems in the neighborhood. The most serious problem in this tract was the rundown condition of the business area, cited by the greatest number of residents - half the total sample. This supports Aldrich & Reiss' findings (1976) as well as those of Yancey and Ericksen (1979), relating racial composition to decline in facilities. Next in order of seriousness was the condition of the streets, with almost half of the respondents citing this as a serious or somewhat serious problem. Third in order of seriousness was crime, in keeping with findings elsewhere (Ahlbrandt 1979; Bradburn et al 1971; Varady 1979.)

(Table 5 about here)

Considering the two most serious problems, the most significant background variables associated with each included race. Regression analyses indicated that length of residence and race were the most significant background variables associated with the problem of the business area being considered run down. People who lived in the neighborhood longest had the highest percentage viewing this concern as a serious problem (30%). Only half as many (16%) of those with shorter tenure viewed this as a serious problem. Whites viewed this as a serious problem more than blacks (29% compared to 15%), which is also reflected in the fact that they used the facilities less than blacks. Of those who did not view this as a problem, 58% were black compared to 42% who were white. Thus the neighborhood and its amenities were perceived differently by residents of different races.

Some examples of concern with the condition of the business area (Copley Road) are offered in the following statements obtained during the interviews:

"I'm planning to move, because of the deterioration of the businesses" (white, over age 65, tenure over 10 yrs.)

"Some areas are beginning to deteriorate. We need to encourage good businesses to move in and get the liquor stores and beer halls out" (black, age 45-54, tenure 3-10 yrs.)

"Copley Road is a hell hole" (white, over 65, tenure over 10 yrs.)

"We need to fix Copley Road, get rid of the bars and chicken fast food places" (white, age over 65, tenure 10 yrs.+)

"Neighbors advise me not to shop on Copley Rd. It's dangerous - trashy people hang out there"(white, 55, 3-10yrs.)

"The business area is my biggest concern. We should revoke liquor licenses and get rid of the bars"(black,25, 3-10yrs.)

"We need to add better shops" (black, 45-54, tenure 10 yrs.+).

Second in importance as a serious concern in the tract was the condition of the streets, with the most significant background variables being race, occupation, and age in that order according to the regressions. More blacks (60%) than whites (40%) saw this as a serious or somewhat serious problem. This may well reflect differences in where they were located, with a greater proportion of blacks living on streets of poorer condition. This is supported by an analysis of racial composition of the blocks in the tract, and their actual condition.

The third most important concern, crime, showed no significant differences in background variables associated with this problem. National studies have indicated that perceptions of crime are important predictors of general neighborhood ratings (HUD 1979), yet the neighborhood ratings in this study were generally high despite the perception of crime as a serious problem. In fact, there were no significant differences between black and white respondents on overall neighborhood ratings or neighborhood satisfaction. The differences appeared only when specific concerns were analyzed through step-wise regressions.

One specific concern that has been of critical importance in neighborhood stabilization is schools (Ahlbrandt 1979; Bradburn et al 1971; Varady 1979.) Though it ranked tenth in order of importance in the Akron study, with only 16% of all respondents seeing this as a serious or somewhat serious problem, further analyses of the 16% revealed significant racial differences. Twice as many whites (12%) saw this as a serious problem as blacks (6%). The differences were magnified when controlling for type

of school used (public or parochial or private.) Four times as many of those using private or parochial schools (21%) saw the schools as a serious problem compared to those who used the public schools (6%). This was also related to race, since three times as many of the white respondents (43%) had their children in private or parochial school compared to black respondents (14%). The most important factor in the public schools for whites was the racial composition, as revealed in interview narratives. Typical of the comments made about the schools are these:

> "We need to fight for integrated schools .. segregated schools lead to poorer facilities" (black, age 65+, tenure 3-10 yrs.)
>
> "The schools worry me because we won't keep the good teachers if the neighborhood is black" (black, age 35-44, tenure 10 yrs.+).
>
> "I'm worried about the racial balance. Families with kids come into a store and can't read candy labels. If the schools were 50/50 that would help. I'm thinking of sending my kids to a private school in the fall... I'm uncertain about what to do ..." (white, age 25-34, tenure 1-3 yrs.)
>
> "If schools were integrated that would help. I can't see my child being the only white. We need to have the schools integrated in order to continue attracting young professionals to the neighborhood" (white, age 25-34, tenure 10+.)

Impact of WSN. To assess the impact of the thirteen year old (in 1979) neighborhood organization, respondents were asked if they had heard about West Side Neighbors before they got the flyer announcing the survey. A substantial majority (82%) said they had. Only 16% said they had not, and 2% were uncertain. Asked how they had heard about the organization, 75% said from other members, 20% from friends, and 4% from meetings or events.

To find out whether they could correctly state the complex purpose of the organization, they were asked what they thought the purpose of WSN was. More than half (51%) answered correctly or partially correctly, 11% were uncertain, 3% answered incorrectly, and 31% were unable to state the purpose at all. To be coded correct or partially correct, an answer had to contain either of these two purposes: racial integration maintenance and/or neighborhood improvement. The data indicate that the organization is widely known in the area, and its purpose quite well understood.

To further test the effect of the organization, cross-tabulations were analyzed for only those who correctly or partially correctly stated the purpose of WSN. Though I found no association (Chi square) between knowledge of the organization and neighborhood satisfaction, I did find a relationship for white residents only between knowledge of the organization and attitudes toward the future (optimism.) When asked what they thought the neighborhood would be like in five years, twice as many knowledgeable (about WSN) whites thought the neighborhood would be better in five years than those who were not knowledgeable about WSN.[5] For blacks, knowledge of the organization did not affect their views of the future of the neighborhood. Generally, blacks were less neighborly, less satisfied, and less optimistic about the future. Table 6 shows the association between knowledge of the organization and attitudes toward the future of the neighborhood.

(Table 6 about here)

Real Estate Activity. More than half (55%) of the respondents said they had been solicited by real estate agents who asked them to

consider selling their homes. When asked how often, most said three to six times (42%), a third (31%) said over six times, and a quarter (25%) said one or two times. When asked how this contact was made, most cited multiple contacts (40%), i.e., by phone, mail, and in person. Only 5% mentioned mail only, and the rest said contacts were in person (28%) or by phone (26%). Heavy real estate activity in the area was indicated by the data. Evidence of concern over the real estate activity in the area is seen in the following comments:

" I was solicited 25 times by real estate agents wanting me to sell:

" I don't know my neighbors any more because every time I turn around people are moving out. It seems that when blacks move in whites move out. When one neighbor puts a sign out, several do."

"I've been here 11 years. We were the 2nd black family. It seems like you move in and white people move out. White flight is one of the major west side problems."

"I'm very angry about agents who keep coming around wanting me to sell."

"Several times agents have come by asking if I wanted to sell. They said they had buyers for our house if we wanted to sell. I said we weren't interested. They are a bunch of vultures."

"Turnover is the biggest problem. I've lost pride in my neighborhood and home. I'm going to get out when I can afford to, so I'm doing nothing to fix my house up. I think this feeling of indifference is common because of the turnover."

"One real estate agent was persistent to the point of being harrassing."

Among the reasons mentioned for being first attracted to the neighborhood were (in order of frequency): appearance, particular home, convenience, good values, good schools, and friends or relatives in the area. Only 1% said the agent in-

fluenced them, and 8% mentioned "other" reasons for moving into the neighborhood, including integrated living. A majority (58%) named more than one reason for moving there.

Moving Plans. Respondents were asked if they expected to move from the neighborhood in the next year, and why. Seventeen percent were uncertain, 77% said no, and 6% did expect to move. Of those who did expect to move most were moving out of town, the rest elsewhere in the city. Asked about moving plans in the future, a third said yes, a third said no, and the rest were uncertain or did not answer. Of those who did expect to move sometime in the future, the reasons given in order of frequency were: better house, better job, retirement, better neighborhood, better climate, better schools.

Of those who did not expect to move in the future, the following reasons were given for wanting to stay:
"I like this neighborhood" (35%), "I like this house" (30%), "Other areas too inconvenient" (19%), "Other areas too expensive" (9%), "Friends and relatives here" (7%), "I like the schools"(6%). A majority named more than one reason for wanting to stay (53%). Most respondents (94%) were either very satisfied or pretty satisfied with their house.

Future Of The Neighborhood. When asked what they thought the neighborhood would be like in five years, 42% said the same, 23% said better, 21% said worse, and 15% said they didn't know. The latter 36% may be the most likely potential movers, depending on their circumstances and the neighborhood's. An analysis of their comments reveals their views, here categorized as to pessimists and optimists.

Pessimists: Black

"People don't know how to keep it better, they don't take care of it (the neighborhood). It's a black neighborhood and this happens to black neighborhoods everywhere. People don't keep them up and the city and landlords neglect them."

"Some areas are beginning to deteriorate. When I first moved in the neighborhood was predominantly white, but when black people move in white people move out. It wouldn't matter to me as long as it's a nice neighborhood. But if low income people move this way, with many kids in the streets, the homes will run down ..."

"It's changed in the last ten years I've been here. Many people don't keep up their property. People are younger and a little rowdy. Nobody's out there fixing streets and lights. We need to improve these ..."

White

"Turnover is resulting in too many transients. We need to encourage older whites to move here."

"I've lost interest in the neighborhood. I think of this as a 'colored' community. They come and go. I'm not a racist but I like harmony. This used to be an exclusive area, but not any more. People across the street were robbed twice in the last two years."

"People from the dumps are moving in. There are only 3 whites left on this side of the street. We need a better class of people in here, who will keep kids in their own yards. The house on the corner was very unkempt. The Health Dept. had to break in and empty it."

Optimists: Black

"Everybody seems to care and wants their houses to look good."

"People are moving back in and will have money to keep up their properties."

"People keep up their property and the kids are not rowdy."

"People are moving in and sprucing up."

White

"Many nice people are buying and moving in. But we need to put a stop to real estate people trying to sway people to leave."

"The gas shortage will force people to move back... young families moving will make it better."

"Younger people are moving in ... the gas crunch helped."

"New people are coming in and making property improvement. People are becoming more willing to work together."

For Sale. A special subsurvey was conducted of all those in the tract who had For Sale signs on their properties. They were all interviewed by the same person, for standardization. Of the 55 homes with For Sale signs in the tract, only 38 had residents who were available for the interviewing. This number was too small to apply statistical tests of significance to the data obtained. The findings that follow pertain only to this subsurvey of people who were moving away from the neighborhood, or trying to move.

Compared to the total sample, those moving away were younger, had higher incomes, had more children under 19, and were mostly white (76%). Their use of the facilities was considerably less than the rest of the respondents. Their neighboring was about the same, but their satisfaction with the neighborhood was lower than the rest of the respondents. Their specific concerns were ranked differently from the rest of the sample, with a much higher percent viewing each of the following as serious problems: noise, schools, housing, garbage collection, lighting, and parks and playgrounds (in that order). More named turnover as a serious problem (26% compared to 15% in the rest of the sample), and a much higher proportion cited schools and housing as serious problems (24% compared to 17% and 16% for the rest of the sample. Movers showed a lower level of knowledge about West Side Neighbors (76% compared to 82%) and a smaller

proportion who could correctly or partially correctly state the purpose of WSN (only 37% compared to 51% for the rest of the sample.) About a third (29%) of those moving away were moving to another neighborhood in the city, 34% were moving to another city in the state, 24% were moving out of the state, and 11% didn't know where they would move to.

Summary and Discussion

The data show that the residents of this biracial tract in Akron were homeowners of middle and moderate-income levels. Slightly less than half were black, slightly more than half were white. Blacks were younger, had more children under 19, and lived in the neighborhood fewer years than whites. Most of the black children were in public school, while a much higher proportion of the white children were in private or parochial school.

Most residents had a strong identification with the neighbothood, a high level of neighboring and a high level of neighborhood satisfaction. More blacks used the business and shopping area than whites, indicating some abandonment by whites of the main business area, especially for grocery shopping. This is consistent with findings in other reported research of urban transitional neighborhoods, where business areas come to be perceived by whites as deteriorating and a predominantly black area (Aldrich and Reiss 1976.)

Though previous research (Aldrich and Reiss 1976) has found a causal sequence between residential racial succession and business succession (turnover), I suggest an additive causal sequence

based on this study. Given the fact that residential racial succession does lead to some business turnover, the process of succession may be a circular one rather than a linear one, with each step in the process leading to further turnover. Moreover, a third equally significant factor in this process is the change in the racial composition of the schools of the neighborhood, which further expands the circular process. These are the interacting links in this model of neighborhood succession:

(Figure 1. An Additive Model of Neighborhood Succession)

To support this model, a study of 1300 businesses in ten major cities concluded that noneconomic factors such as schools, public services, and crime rates, play a larger role in corporate decisions to expand or relocate than purely financial factors like tax rates and labor costs (Joint Economic Committee 1979.) This contrasts with Aldrich and Reiss' findings (1976) which showed no association between perceptions of increasing crime and business survival in racially changing areas. However, they did find such an association in retail trades. The importance of the schools in maintaining the stability of a neighborhood has been noted by a growing number of scholars (Ahlbrandt 1979; Bradburn, Sudman and Glockel 1971; Varady 1979.) Both Ahlbrandt (1979) and Varady (1979) state that the schools are a very important factor in the decision of those with children to move out of a neighborhood.

This additive model of succession is not meant to imply the inevitability of neighborhood resegregation, however. The single most encouraging fact emerging from the Akron data is

that young white families were moving back into the study neighborhood at almost the same rate as young black families. They were, moreover, of a high educational level. This trend, if continued, could achieve the neighborhood stabilization so long sought by the neighborhood organization (WSN.)

As a counter-balance to this positive finding is the sobering fact that those moving away from the neighborhood were overwhelmingly white, young, and of high socio-economic level. Though few of these movers directly referred to any disappointment with the neighborhood, their satisfaction scores were lower than those of the rest of the sample. Their specific concerns indicate that they were more distressed about the neighborhood and its future than the stayers. Their perceptions, in fact, may have been among the underlying causes of their moving. The self-fulfilling prophecy at work here seems to be based on fear of further turnover, making that fear become a reality with the act of moving away.

We can safely say that whether people stay or move depends on two types of circumstances: those relating to themselves and those relating to their neighborhood. Some of the earliest theories on moving decisions (Leslie and Richardson 1961; Rossi 1955; Wolpert 1965) suggest that a family's decision to move is based on their stage in the life cycle, their mobility potential, the characteristics of their home and neighborhood, and their attachment and participation in the neighborhood. However, the decision to move is only one solution to dissatisfaction (Bach and Smith 1977; Speare 1974; Wolpert 1965), which may be reduced by other means. Finally, housing alternatives are constrained by income and housing

supply. The families with fewest choices are those poor and old, since they can neither buy nor drive. But for those who are the potential movers, what happens to the neighborhood will critically affect whether they stay or leave. And the businesses and schools are as important as the homes and streets in affecting those moving decisions, according to the additive model.

Despite the negative conclusions drawn from the subsample of those moving away from the Akron neighborhood, there are the reassuring but surprising findings of much neighboring and high satisfaction with the neighborhood by a majority of the residents. This defies all previous assumptions about alienation resulting from more than a decade of rapid racial and economic turnover in this tract. Why? I suggest two possible reasons for the unexpectedly high level of neighboring and satisfaction.

First, I suggest that the unhappy residents left the neighborhood a long time ago. Those that remain are of four types: 1. Newcomers, who consist of a) stayers of choice, and b) potential movers, and 2. Oldtimers, who are composed of a) stayers of choice, and b) stayers of circumstance.

(Figure 2. Transitional Neighborhood Resident Types)

Type 1 residents are those who moved in for reasons of economics and convenience, but who plan to leave as soon as it is feasible to do so. They do not plan to remain indefinitely. They are mostly white, with some higher socio-economic level blacks. These are the residents who are most uncertain about the future of the neighborhood. Type 2 residents are newcomers

who moved in knowing full well what to expect of the neighborhood, and consciously choosing an integrated way of life for themselves and their families. They are black and white, they plan to stay indefinitely, and are prepared to make it work.

Type 3 residents are long-term homeowners who have remained because of choice, and plan to remain indefinitely. They have witnessed the rapid racial and economic turnover of the neighborhood, and have hoped for an eventual stabilization. They are both black and white, and some of them were the founders and original supporters of the neighborhood stabilization group of West Side Neighbors.

Type 4 are long-term residents who have remained because of circumstances, but who would like to leave if they could. They are "trapped" (Gans, 1962) because of insufficient resources or because of their stage of the life cycle (elderly). They know they can't leave and may have decided to make their peace with the situation. They are mostly white. The data comparing white newcomers to white oldtimers are revealing and supportive of this explanation. White newcomers (1 to 3 years) were more satisfied (54%) than white oldtimers (40%).

A second explanation of the surprisingly high levels of neighboring and satisfaction links these with the data indicating a strong level of knowledge about West Side Neighbors. This is significant. There may well be a sense of trust prevailing in the neighborhood, as a result of the work of this organization for the previous 13 years. Knowing or <u>thinking</u> that there is a "big brother" out there taking care of things may offer a hope and confidence in the neighborhood and its po-

tential for the future. This may well have provided the "social construction of the community" (Suttles, 1972) during a time when the community was actually crumbling. It is especially interesting to note, in this connection, that the movers showed a lower level of knowledge about WSN than the rest of the sample, and a lower level of satisfaction with the neighborhood. Others have linked neighborhood commitment to satisfaction (Ahlbrandt 1979; Varady 1979), and satisfaction to residential stability (Varady 1979.)

Policy Implications

Using these theories as a framework, I suggest four possibilities for retaining the stayers and deterring the movers. This represents a comprehensive strategy for achieving neighborhood stabilization in transitional areas. Clearly, neighboring and satisfaction are not enough to stabilize such areas.

The Business Area. The single most pressing concern in the Akron study area was the condition of the main business street. Vacant stores and rundown properties are combined with undesirable businesses as the reasons for this concern. This is consistent with findings in other transitional areas (Aldrich 1975; Aldrich and Reiss 1976.) For such areas consultation should be sought to determine the best land use for the business section. It may be that businesses are not the best replacement for vacant or undesirable existing properties. Perhaps multi-family low-rise housing would be more suitable and needed. Perhaps some mini-parks would be the best substitute for the decaying structures of the area. Or, perhaps a combination of both of these. Cer-

tainly rehabilitation is not enough for such an area. Technical assistance is needed to develop plans for the revitalization and beautification of the business area, based on the possibilities of revised land use.

If businesses are determined to be most desirable for this area, there must be a vigorous effort to attract the types of business that would improve a critical main artery. It may be that the area would need to be levelled first before any viable businesses could be attracted to the area. An intense affirmative marketing effort would need to be developed in order to confront and overcome the negative images of this long neglected area.

Using the additive model of neighborhood succession, we can predict that if no change occurs in the condition of the present business area, resident dissatisfaction may eventually result in the complete abandonment and resegregation of the entire tract and its adjacent ones, with only the lowest socio-economic levels of residents remaining.

The Schools. The interrelationship of schools with housing patterns is well known and well documented (Society 1979.) One needs only to search the real estate ads in any local newspaper to see how often the schools are noted in the housing section. While it is true that originally it was segregated neighborhoods that led to segregated schools, this causal sequence has now been reversed. People now, especially with children of school age, choose their neighborhoods on the basis of the perceived quality of the schools. And their perception of quality is strongly associated with the racial composition of the schools (Ahlbrandt 1979; Bradburn, Sudman and Glockel 1971; Molotch 1972; Varady 1979.)

Thus it is important for city and regional planners and government officials to work closely with school administrators concerning plans that vitally affect both, i.e., highway construction, homesteading, regional mobility plans, public housing site location, new construction, and other related programs that affect dislocation and relocation of households and businesses.

Two specific efforts that may have positive results elsewhere are: 1) Affirmative Marketing programs, such as the one in Louisville, Kentucky linking school desegregation and housing opportunities (Kentucky Commission on Human Rights 1980.) and 2) Fair Housing Program Expansion, strengthening metropolitan efforts in the broadening of housing opportunities for minorities and low and moderate income households (Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission 1978; Orfield 1982.) Financial incentives for those making pro-integration moves should be implemented. If such incentives are used daily in the business world to encourage expansion and investment, why not to encourage freedom of choice and movement in housing?

Neighborhood Organization Support. If the lifeline of transitional neighborhoods is to be found in indigenous neighborhood organizations, technical assistance is needed to enable them to function effectively. The problem with most such organizations is that they lack adequate day-to-day coordination of their programs. Frequently, they lack leadership with organizational skills. Some minimal funding should be set aside by cities for this purpose so that neighborhood associations can hire part-time staff to meet their daily needs. In addition, funding source information and grant proposal assistance should be provided.

Residents respond to such organizations with a trust and motivation that make it possible to effect small and large changes that might not happen otherwise. Without these organizations, it is doubtful that stabilization efforts would continue, and these transitional neighborhoods would doubtless become resegregated. This is so because of the socio-historical past of such areas. They have unique histories compared to other neighborhoods in the city, and they require unique programs to overcome past practices, policies, and perceptions (Helper 1969; Saltman 1971, 1978.) But, organizations are not enough to achieve stabilization.

Special Programs For Special Neighborhoods. Two examples of unique programs that could be implemented in transitional neighborhoods elsewhere are: 1) An equity assurance program, and 2) A promotional campaign. An equity assurance program is a community-sponsored program that would reimburse residents for up to 80% of any losses incurred in the sale of their homes after five years. It works in Oak Park, Illinois where the local government sponsors it (Oak Park Village Ordinance, 1977.) It is a model for transitional communities faced with potential flight who wish to stabilize and attract new residents.

The only cost to residents who enroll in the program is that of a property appraisal by a certified appraiser approved by local government officials. The money to pay for the program is obtained from tax revenues and enters a cash pool for reimbursing homeowners as needed. The Oak Park program is the result of a six-year study that began when urban experts predicted that a westward expansion of blacks from adjacent areas would turn the

community into a resegregated area. The theory behind the program is that if a municipality can guarantee that housing values will not drop below a certain level, panic selling by whites will not occur when a neighborhoods becomes integrated.

Housing values in Oak Park have risen steadily since the local officials began promoting this policy. In addition to the equity assurance program, the local government's policies include banning For Sale signs, prohibition of solicitation by realtors, increased of housing and building codes, and passage of a bond issue creating low cost home improvement loans for residents. Other municipalities have instituted similar programs in Baltimore and Shaker Heights, Ohio.

Neighborhood promotion campaigns (Baltimore Neighborhoods 1979; West Side Neighbors 1980) also work toward the maintenance of quality, integrated neighborhoods but focus on creating a positive image of the transitional areas. Such efforts are directed to key institutional decision-makers affecting the life and death of neighborhoods, i.e., lending institutions, real estate companies, and corporate executives. This is an intensive public relations campaign and includes mass distribution of literature, wide use of all media, and face-to-face meetings with major executives of the three institutional networks. The objective is to foster cordial relations, understanding, and positive policies of reinvestment and affirmative marketing in the target areas.

Conclusion

The maintenance of an integrated urban neighborhood cannot occur with only a neighborhood stabilization organization at work. That is a necessary but insufficient condition for success. The

provision of active neighboring does heighten a sense of community and neighborhood satisfaction, and even results in a reduction of crime (Advisory Commission 1973.) But these alone cannot bring about stabilization or the avoidance of resegregation.

It is clear that external forces and institutional processes affect neighborhoods of all types, and these must be included in any strategies for neighborhood stabilization.

Specific policies to achieve stabilization of urban integrated neighborhoods depend on these seven conditions:

1. Maintenance of a flow of both blacks and whites into the area.
2. Reduction of the mobility potential of residents by improving the neighborhood schools and business areas in quality, racial balance, and security.
3. Maintenance of quality housing and streets to insure pride and eventual stabilization of the area as a desirable integrated neighborhood.
4. Reduction of residents' anxiety about the neighborhood by alleviating fears of loss of money, status, security, and neighborliness.
5. Provision of an adequate supply of housing for people of all income levels throughout the metropolitan area.
6. Provision of some living examples of freedom of choice in housing: Black families in suburban neighborhoods and schools, and in white city neighborhoods and schools, and white families in integrated city neighborhoods and schools. Incentive payments for pro-integrative moves could assist this objective.
7. Public commitment by city, county, state, and federal officials

to insure that expenditures of government funds will foster integrated living rather than maintain segregated living. Relevant government spending should be supported by an impact statement detailing how those expenditures will decrease de facto residential and school segregation and increase respectively residential and school integration in the community.

These conditions are essential to counteract all the previous years of stereotyping and misconception about integrated neighborhoods. A vigilant ongoing effort is needed to maintain contact with the major institutional networks. Their understanding and cooperation must be secured to achieve constructive changes in policies and practices affecting the death and life of integrated neighborhoods. Such integration is achieved and maintained with great difficulty. It requires special and extraordinary efforts to sustain it.

NOTES

1. Field notes and observations were obtained during the author's residence in the study area since 1955.
2. Question items were dropped from the Indexes if they correlated less than .40 with the total mean score for each Index.
3. In 1970 the percent black ranged from 4.5 to 27.3 in the three tracts of the Rochester study area.
4. In 1970 the percent black ranged from 1 to 26 in the four communities studied by Zehner.
5. Responses were categorized as "Better, The Same, Worse, or Don't Know". Though "the same" could be either optimistic or pessimistic, analysis of all "the same" comments indicated that 88% of those comments were positive. Based on this finding, optimists included "Better" and "The Same", and Pessimists included "Worse" and "Don't Know".
6. Partially derived and adapted from Wm. McFee.(1980).

Acknowledgement. This research was assisted by a Faculty Research grant from the Research Office of Kent State University, and technical aid from the City of Akron Planning Department. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the annual meetings of the North Central Sociological Association, 1981.

REFERENCES

Advisory Commission On Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. 1973. "Community Crime Prevention." Washington, D.C.

Ahlbrandt, Roger S. and James V. Cunningham. 1979. A New Public Policy For Neighborhood Preservation. New York: Praeger.

Ahlbrandt, Roger S. and Paul C. Brophy. 1975. Neighborhood Revitalization. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books.

Aldrich, Howard. 1975. "Ecological Succession in Racially Changing Neighborhoods: A Review of the Literature." Urban Affairs Quarterly 10 No.3: 327-48.

Aldrich,H. and A.J. Reiss. 1976. "The Race Composition of Neighborhood Businesses." American Journal of Sociology 81,4.

Bach, R.L. and J. Smith. 1977. "Community Satisfaction, Expectation of Moving and Migration." Demography 14:147-67.

Baltimore Neighborhoods, Inc. 1979. "Baltimore Plan For Affirmative Marketing in Real Estate." Baltimore.

Bailey, M.J. 1966. "Effects of Race and Other Demographic Factors on the Value of Single Family Homes." Land Economics 42:215-220.

Blair, John P. 1973. "A Review of the Filtering-Down Theory." Urban Affairs Quarterly 8,3.

Bradburn, Norman, Seymour Sudman and Galen Glockel. 1971. Side By Side: Integrated Neighborhoods in America. Chicago: Quadrangle.

Bruner, John M. 1970. "The Effects of Racial Integration on Property Values and Real Estate Practices." Los Angeles: Research Institute for Business and Economics, U. of California.

Fischer, Claude. 1976. The Urban Experience. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Galster, G. and G. Hesser. 1980. "The Social Neighborhood As Housing Producer." Unpublished paper.

Gans, Herbert. 1962. "Urbanism and suburbanism as ways of life: A reevaluation of definitions." In A.M. Rose (ed.) Human Behavior and Social Processes. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Ginsberg, Yona. 1975. Jews In A Changing Neighborhood. New York: Free Press.

Helper, Rose. 1969. Racial Policies and Practices of Real Estate Brokers. Minneapolis: U. of Minnesota Press.

Hunter, Albert. 1975. "Loss of Community." American Sociological Review. 40,5.

Joint Economic Committee. 1979. Publications Department. G. Washington, D.C.: Senate Office Building.

Kentucky Commission on Human Rights. 1980. "Six Ways To Avoid Busing." Louisville.

Leslie, G.R. and A.H. Richardson. 1961. "Life Cycles, Career Patterns and Decision to Move." American Sociological Review. 26:894-902.

Little, James, Hugh Nourse, and Donald Phares. 1975. "The Neighborhood Succession Process." Washington: Public Affairs Counseling. U.S. Government Printing Office.

Marsh, R.J. 1968. "The Residential Enclave: Control of the Deterioration of an Inner City Neighborhood." Ann Arbor: University Microfilms. (Ph.D. Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967.)

McFee, William. 1980. "Residential Resettlement." Paper presented at annual meetings of American Sociological Association. New York.

Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission. 1978. "Fair Share Planning and Implementation." Dayton.

Molotch, Harvey. 1972. Managed Integration. Berkeley: U. of California Press.

Morris, D. and K. Hess. 1975. Neighborhood Power: The New Localism. Boston: Beacon.

Oak Park Village. 1977. Ordinance For Equity Assurance. Illinois.

O'Brien, David. 1975. Neighborhood Organization and Interest Group Processes. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Orfield, Gary. 1982. "Toward A Strategy For Urban Integration." New York: The Ford Foundation.

Przbylski, Michael et al. 1978. "Perceptions of Risk: The Banker's Myth." Chicago: National Training and Information Center.

Rossi, Peter. 1955. Why Families Move. Glencoe: Free Press.

Saltman, Juliet. 1971. Open Housing As A Social Movement. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books.

_____. 1978. Integrated Neighborhoods In Action. (Ed.) Washington, D.C.: National Neighbors.

_____. 1980. "Action Research on Redlining." Urban Affairs Papers. 2,4:20-33.

Society. 1979. "School Desegregation and Residential Segregation." 16,5. (A. Billingsley et al.)

Speare, A. 1974. "Residential Satisfaction As An Intervening Variable in Residential Movility." Demography 11: 173-88.

Suttles, G. 1972. The Social Construction of Communities. Chicago: U. of Chicago Press.

Taylor, D.Garth. 1979. "Housing, Neighborhoods, and Race Relations." Annals, 441.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). 1979.a. "The Determinants of Neighborhood Quality." Washington.

_____. 1979 b. Annual Housing Survey of 1976. Washington.

Varady, David. 1979. Ethnic Minorities in Urban Areas. Boston: M.Nijhoff.

Wellman, B. and B. Leighton. 1979. "Networks, Neighborhoods, and Communities." Urban Affairs Quarterly.14,3:363-390.

West Side Neighbors. 1980."Report of UPON Project, Year One." Akron, Ohio.

Wolpert, Julian. 1965. "Behavioral Aspects of the Decision to Migrate." Papers of the Regional Science Association 15: 159-69.

Yancey, William and E. Ericksen. 1979. "The Antecedents of Community." American Sociological Review,44,2.

Zehner,R. and S. Chapin. 1974. Across The City Line. Lexington: D.C. Heath & Co.

Table 1

Racial Change In Study Area, 1960-1980

Tract	Per Cent Black		
	1960	1970	1980
5061	0	.3	9
5062*	0	11	57
5063	23	77	85
5064	0	4	16
5065	0	27	75

Source: U.S. Census 1960, 1970, 1980.

*Survey site.

Table 2

Stepwise Regression Analyses Of Three Indexes By Race And Independent Variables

A. Facility Use (R^2 Values)

Variable	White	Variable	Black	Variable	All Respondents
Yrs.in N	.12**	Location	.06*	Location	.08*
Occ.	.19***	Education	.08*	Race	.11* a)
Sex	.20**	Yrs.in N	.11*	Yrs.in N	.17*
Children	.23**	School b)	.12	Sex	.18
Total (with 5 additional factors) Explained Variance	.29		.15		.21 c)

B. Neighboring

Location	.10***	Yrs.in N	.15***	Yrs.in N	.03*
Yrs.in N	.13**	Children	.24***	Location	.06*
Children	.17*	Location	.26***	Race	.08*
Age	.19**	Income	.28***	Occ.	.09
Total Explained Variance	.21		.31		.25

C. Neighborhood Satisfaction

Location*	.06	Location	.04	Yrs. in N	.03*
Age	.08	Occ.	.08	Location	.06*
Occ.	.10	School	.10*	Race	.08*
Children	.11	Yrs.in N	.13*	Occ.	.09
Total Explained Variance	.12		.14		.10

* F significant at .05 level.
** " " .01 level.
*** " " .001 level.

a) Race and Location (of block) show multicollinearity because of racial concentration in housing. Further block analysis and elaboration indicated that race was more important than location for facility use.

b) School refers to type, i.e., public or private.

c) The complete list of independent variables was: age, children, education, income, location, occupation, race, school, sex, and years in the neighborhood. These were selected after analysis of cross-tabulations and elaboration.

Table 3

Neighboring In Transitional Area

A. Number of Neighbors' Names Known

Number	Per Cent
6 or more	61
3 to 5	24
1 or 2	11
None	4
	100 (N=312)

B. Chatting And Visiting With Neighbors

Frequency	Per Cent	
	Chat	Visit
Often	29	17
Sometimes	48	37
Rarely	20	23
Never	3	23
	100	100
	(N=312)	

Table 4

Neighborhood Satisfaction

A. Rating of Neighborhood

	Per Cent
Excellent	27
Good	43
Average	25
Below Average	7
	100 (N=312)

B. Degree of Satisfaction

Very Satisfied	45
Pretty Satisfied	45
Not Very Satisfied	7
Not At All Satisfied	3
	100 (N=312)

C. Satisfaction Scores By Race

	Black	White	Total
High or Fairly High	77	81	79
Moderate or Low	23	19	21
	100	100	100
N=	(146)	(166)	(312)

Table 5

Rank Order Of Problems Rated As Serious Or Somewhat Serious

	Problem	Per Cent
1.	Business Area Run Down	50
2.	Streets (paving, holes)	49
3.	Crime	40
4.	Dogs Loose	37
5.	Noise	35
6.	Street Lighting Poor	29
7.	Inadequate Parks, Playgrounds	24
8.	Kids Uncontrolled	22
9.	Housing (vacant, unkempt)	17
10.	Schools	16
11.	Sewers (poor drainage)	16
12.	Inadequate Social Activities	16
13.	Lawns and Yards (not kept up)	15
14.	Turnover (neighbors moving)	15
15.	Sports Inadequate	12
16.	Undesirable Neighbors	12
17.	Teenage Activities Inadequate	12
18.	Bus Service Inadequate	11
19.	Child Care Facilities Inadequate	9
20.	Seniors' Activities Inadequate	8
21.	Garbage Collection Inadequate	6

Table 6

Organizational Knowledge By Perceptions of Neighborhood Future And Race

	Optimists and Pessimists By Race[a]						
Organizat'l Knowledge[b]	Black		White		All[c]		Total
	+	-	+	-	+	-	
Known	41	30	74	25	115	55	170
Unknown	43	32	43	24	86	56	142
Total	84	62	117	49	201	111	312
	n.s.		p>.05		n.s.		

a) Optimists were those who answered the question, "What do you think the neighborhood will be like in five years?" with responses of "Better" and "Same". Pessimists were those who answered the question with "Worse" and "Don't Know." Optimists are shown as +, pessimists as -.

b) Those who knew about WSN and correctly understood its purpose are shown as K, those who did not know about it are shown as U.

c) $X^2=4.21$, df=1

Figure 1

An Additive Model Of Neighborhood Succession

Figure 2

Transitional Neighborhood Resident Types By Mobility Potential And Tenure

Tenure	Mobility Potential: Movers	Stayers: Choice	Stayers: Circumstance
Newcomers	Type 1	Type 2	
Oldtimers		Type 3	Type 4